

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 6, 2009, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6-7, 18, 21-24, 27-29 and 32 remain in this application, where claims 1, 18 and 28 are independent.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 27 for a certain informality. In response, claim 27 has been amended to remove the noted informality. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to claim 27 has been overcome and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, to advance prosecution, claims 1, 18 and 28 have been amended for better clarity. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection of claims 1 and 28 has been overcome.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6-7, 18-19, 22-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP 2002-014359 (Masahide). Claims 1, 6-7, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 27-29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,273,475 (Oshikawa). Claims 1, 6-7, 18-19, 22-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masahide in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0003711 (Hashimoto). Claims 1, 6-7, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 27-29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Oshikawa in view Hashimoto. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Masahide in view of Hashimoto and U.S. Patent No. 4,592,623 (Yamamoto). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6-7, 18, 21-24, 27-29 and 32 are patentable over Masahide, Oshikawa, Hashimoto and Yamamoto for at least the following reasons.

On page 4 of the Office Action, last bullet point, it is alleged that Masahide discloses or suggests an additional film which is thicker at the edge of the display layer. No citation or any section of Masahide is provided. A careful review of Masahide

reveals that all the layers have uniform thicknesses, as clearly shown in the Masahide figures.

In fact, page 9 of the Office Action, item 32, correctly notes that Masahide does not disclose or suggest any additional film which is thicker at the edge of the display layer. Paragraphs [0054] and [0059] of Hashimoto is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Masahide.

Paragraph [0054] of Hashimoto refers to FIGs 5, 6A and 6B, where FIGs 6A-6B are also referred to on page 2 of the Office Action, in the Response to Amendment section. A careful review of FIGs 5, 6A and 6B shows that all the layers have uniform thicknesses. Further, paragraph [0059] of Hashimoto merely describes placing a light source at the periphery.

On page 6 of the Office Action, last bullet point, it is alleged that Oshikawa discloses or suggests an additional film which is thicker at the edge of the display layer. Again, no citation or any section of Masahide is provided. A careful review of Oshikawa reveals that all the layers have uniform thicknesses, as clearly shown in the Oshikawa figures.

In fact, page 12 of the Office Action, item 42, correctly notes that Oshikawa does not disclose or suggest any additional film which is thicker at the edge of the display layer. Paragraphs [0054] and [0059] of Hashimoto is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Oshikawa. As discusses above, paragraphs [0054] and [0059], and FIGs 5, 6A and 6B of Hashimoto only show layers with uniform thicknesses.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 18 and 28, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the additional film is thicker at
the edge than away from the edge.

A film which thicker at the edge than away from the edge is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Masahide, Oshikawa, Hashimoto, and combinations thereof. Yamamoto is cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Masahide, Oshikawa and Hashimoto.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 18 and 28 are allowable, and allowance thereof is

respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6-7, 21-24, 27, 29 and 32 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 18 and 28.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 31, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101